



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,499	09/06/2005	Shuji Kawasaki	270680US0XPCT	4345
22850 7590 02/26/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER KURTZ, BENJAMIN M	
			ART UNIT 1797	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/26/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

<i>Office Action Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/532,499	KAWASAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BENJAMIN KURTZ	1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-13,15,16 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,6,15,16,22 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7,9-13 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15, 16, 19-23 are pending, claims 4, 6, 15, 16, 22 and 23 are withdrawn, claims 2, 8, 14, 17 and 18 are cancelled.

Election/Restrictions

1. Regarding applicant's traversal of the withdrawal of claim 4: Applicant's response to restriction received 7/14/08 elected without traverse specie A and sub-specie (ii). Claim 4 corresponds to a non-elected specie. Also, claims 22 and 23 are withdrawn. Claim 22 recites an x-type zeolite, which is an aluminosilicate which was originally restricted. Claim 23 recites a method for producing a composite adsorbent which was also originally restricted. The restriction is considered final as stated in the previous office action of 8/26/08.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-12, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lisenko US 5 639 550.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 11 and 12, Lisenko teaches a composite adsorbent comprising: a composite powder which is composed of a particulate compound (amorphous titanium silicate) that is 200 microns or less in mean particle diameter and a plastic powder, that is a thermoplastic resin, polyethylene, adhered to the particulate compound, and at least one adsorptive substance (activated carbon) that is particulate (col. 3, line 21 – col. 4, line 21).

Claim 7, Lisenko teaches an adhesion quantity of the particulate compound is 50-95% by weight of the composite powder (col. 5, lines 7-12).

Claim 10, the melt flow rate of the thermoplastic resin is an inherent quality of the resin. Lisenko teaches the same thermoplastic resin, polyethylene, as disclosed by the applicant and is therefore deemed to meet the limitations of the claim.

Claims 19 and 20, the recitation of a water purification material and a water purifier are recitations of the intended use of the product of claim 1. However, Lisenko teaches the composite adsorbent is a water purification material (col. 1, lines 6-10); and because the composite adsorbent is a water purification material it would inherently be used in a water purifier.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1797

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lisenko '550.

Claim 13, Lisenko teaches the composite adsorbent of claim 1 but does not teach the composite adsorbent is molded. “[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 227 USDQ 964 (1985). The process of molding the composite adsorbent is considered to be a structural alternative to the process as taught in Williamson, Lisenko or Sekine.

Claim 21, Lisenko teaches the water purifier of claim 20 but does not teach the lead removal capability of the material. Lisenko teaches the purification material of claim 1. Because Lisenko teaches the claimed composite adsorbent material the lead removal capability is deemed to be inherent in the material of Lisenko. Also, the limitation of the lead removal capability of 35 L or more per cc at a space velocity of 1000/hr is a process limitation that does not further structurally limit the water purifier.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 1797

4. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a composite powder and at least one adsorptive substance as separate and distinct components) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Lisenko also teaches an amorphous titanosilicate particulate compound as claimed.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1797

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN KURTZ whose telephone number is (571)272-8211. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Sample can be reached on 571-272-1376. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Benjamin Kurtz
Examiner
Art Unit 1797

/B. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 1797

/Krishnan S Menon/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797